

Remarks

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed on June 16, 2004. Claims 2-6, 17-21, and 32-34 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 5 and 6. Claim 16 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 20 and 21. Claim 31 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 33 and 34. Claims 1, 7-16, 22-31, and 35-42 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Regarding the "row pointers" recited in the specification and claims, a row pointer is a pointer to the location of a specific set of data in a data set. See, for example, p. 4, l. 19 - p. 5, l. 4 of the present application. It is respectfully suggested that one skilled in the art would understand what a "pointer" is and how to implement a pointer as disclosed and recited in the pending claims to make and/or use the invention. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the compare module 105 shown in Figure 1 of the present application, it is respectfully suggested that one skilled in the art would understand that there are many known methods for comparison of the first row pointer to the second row pointer to determine the state of the data. For example, a method of comparison using checksums similar to that disclosed in Bauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,759, can be used to compare the data referenced by the first and second row pointers disclosed in the present application. It is respectfully suggested that one skilled in the art would understand such methods for comparison and would be able to make and/or use the invention. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding data at block 110 being null, the Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to datasets 381a and 381b shown in Figure 4 and the accompanying description at page 11, line 19 through page 12, line 1 and at page 14, line 15 through page 15, line 20 of the present application. These sections of the application describe how, for example, the first and second

row pointers can be set to null if the data requested by the client does not yet exist. If the client decides to add new information, the second row pointer is set to the data entered by the client. This results in the first row pointer remaining set at null, and the second row pointer being set to the new information entered by the client. When the first and second row pointers are compared, the first row pointer being set to null indicates that no information previously existed, and the second row pointer not being set to null indicates that new information has been added by the client. It is respectfully suggested that one skilled in the art would understand this description of the first row pointer being null and would be able to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding the original row pointer recited in claim 2, it is respectfully noted that claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejection under section 112, first paragraph, are respectfully requested for at least these reasons.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 7, 8, 22, 23, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Regarding claims 7, 22, and 35, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the discussion provided above with respect to the first row pointer being set to null. It is respectfully suggested that these claims are sufficiently definite. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 8, 23, and 36, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to datasets 383a and 383b shown in Figure 4 and the accompanying description at page 12, lines 7-11 and at page 18, lines 1-15 of the present application. These sections of the application describe that, for example, if the second row pointer received from the client is null, the information is noted as having been deleted by the client. It is respectfully suggested that these claims are sufficiently definite. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,759. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of tracking data through a multi-tier computing architecture. Claim 1 recites:

- receiving a request from a client computing system for data from a database;
- initializing a first row pointer of a dataset with data from a database requested by the client computing system in response to the request by the client computing system;
- sending the initialized dataset to the client computing system;
- placing changes to the data by the client computing system in a second row pointer of the dataset;
- receiving the dataset with the changes;
- comparing the first and second row pointers; and
- declaring a state of the data in response to comparing the first and second row pointers.

Bauer does not disclose or suggest initializing a first row pointer of a dataset with data from a database requested by the client computing system in response to the request by the client computing system, sending the initialized dataset to the client computing system, placing changes to the data by the client computing system in a second row pointer of the dataset, receiving the dataset with the changes, and comparing the first and second row pointers, as recited by claim 1.

Bauer discloses, at Figure 5A, a method for performing server database synchronization. See Bauer, col. 9, ll. 35-47. However, Bauer does not disclose or suggest initializing a first row pointer of a dataset with data from a database requested by the client, sending the initialized dataset to the client, placing changes to the data by the client computing system in a second row pointer of the dataset, receiving the dataset with the changes, and comparing the first and second row pointers, as recited by claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 7-15 that depend therefrom, are respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 31, although not identical in scope to claim 1, include limitations similar to those noted above with respect to claim 1. Claims 16 and 31, as well as claims 22-30 and 35-42 that depend respectively therefrom, should therefore be allowable for at least similar reasons to those provide above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.


IV. Conclusion

The remarks set forth above provide certain arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims. There may be other reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and the right to raise any such other reasons or arguments in the future is expressly reserved.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: August 25, 2004


Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471
RAK